

REMARKS

In the final office action mailed April 2, 2002, claims 1 and 2 were allowed; claims 3-14 and 16-23 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 3,696,962 to Fehres et al. ("Fehres"), claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fehres in view of USP 4,177,934 to Hammes et al "Hammes"); claims 3 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammes, and claims 4 & 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hammes.

Claims 1-23 are being resubmitted for the Examiner's consideration.

New Fig. 6a Submitted in Amendment of January 16, 2002

It is noted that the office action summary does not reflect that the Examiner approved the newly submitted drawing. Applicant will assume that the drawing was approved.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended to change "first portion" to --first wall portion-- and also to correct a typographical error in the reference numerals. Entry of the above amendment is requested, since it raises no new issue and requires no new search.


Rejection of Claims 3-23

The rejection of the claims is traversed. In this regard, it is submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of the Fehres and Hammes references cannot be discerned from the explanation provided on pages 2-4 of the office action. Therefore, the Examiner is kindly asked to take into account the arguments set forth in the Amendment filed January 16, 2002 and allow all claims.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 2, 2002


Nanda K. Alapati
For: Victor N. Balancia
PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-4400

Reg. No. 39,893
Reg. No. 31,231